

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexasofan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.repto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/698,555 | 10/31/2003 | Roland Christof Hutter | 21686-US | 9951 |
| 22829 Roche Molecu | 7590 05/15/200 lar Systems, Inc. | EXAMINER | | |
| Patent Law De | partment | BOWERS, NATHAN ANDREW | | |
| 4300 Hacienda Pleasanton, Ca | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| , | | | 1797 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 05/15/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|------------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| | 10/698,555 | HUTTER ET AL. | | | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | NATHAN A. BOWERS | 1797 | | | |

| | NATHAN A. BOWERS | 1797 | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 07 May 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance of | Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | | | | |
| a) \(\bigsiz \) The period for reply expires \(\frac{9}{2}\) months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) \(\bigsiz \) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. I no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: 1 box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW. MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See WFEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.138(a) and me appropriate extension fee awe been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nader 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et fort in (a) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, nay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS. | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See 37 CFR 1.118 and 41.33(s)), 1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 1. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 1. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 1. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) 1. Newly propose of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) 1. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 1. The status of the claim(s) is of the claim(s) allowed: 1. Claim(s) ploteded to: 1. Claim(s) objected to: 1. Cl | isideration and/or search (see NOT (w)), w), w), ref form for appeal by materially rec poorresponding number of finally reje 21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor owable if submitted in a separate, t | "E below); ducing or simplifying the ected claims. mpliant Amendment (I imely filed amendmen | PTOL-324). | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | l and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | s to provide a). | | | | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | itry is below or attach | ed. | | | | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. | t does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | | | |
| 13. Other: | | | | | | | | | |
| | /William H. Beisner/ | nit 1707 | | | | | | | |

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant uses that modifying Tanaam to allow pipetting operations would completely change the principle of operation of Tanaami's device. It is asserted that pipetting operations in the processing chamber would require emoval of the nubber plug which implies removal of the mandatory negative pressure applied inside the device and disruption of the processing chamber.

However, in no way does the Tanaami apparatus require a mandatory negative pressure to induce fluid flow to the processing chamber. Applicant clearly states in paragraph [0036] that the invention is not limited to such a method. Applicant clearly states in paragraph [0037] that the invention is not limited to such a method. Applicant recipies middle of the invention of the processing chamber. Tanaami rubber plug either temporarily or permanently in order to introduce a solution. Such an action would interfere with or change the principle of operation of the Tanaami device because the Tanaami device does not necessarily require the maintenance of an internal neather pressure.